



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/783,854      | 02/20/2004  | Damon Debenedictis   | 65725-0043          | 7640             |

23552 7590 10/01/2007  
MERCHANT & GOULD PC  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

CHUNG TRANS, XUONG MY

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2833

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

10/01/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/783,854

Applicant(s)

DEBENEDICTIS ET AL.

Examiner

Xuong M. Chung-Trans

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 48-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 68-70 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 48-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2833

1. This is responsive to the amendment filed 7/19/07. Claims 1-47 are cancelled and new claims 68-70 have been added. Therefore, claims 48-70 are pending in this application.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 48 -67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meckley et al. (USPN 6,267,628) in view of Fair et al. (USPN 6,250,964).

As per claims 48-49, Meckley discloses a jack assembly (100) substantially as claimed, comprising: a frame (102) including an upper row of jacks (110) and a lower row of jacks (112), each jack including a port for receiving a plug and spring contacts (24, 26, 28, 130) for making electrical contact with the plug, each of the jacks in the upper row being offset horizontally with respect to an adjacent jack in the lower row, the frame including a shield structure (134) for minimizing transmission of electrical signal away from its intended path, the shield structure positioned between the upper row of jacks and the lower row of jacks (see fig. 14). Meckley does not explicitly disclose a vertically offset lower row of jacks and each jack in the upper row being horizontally offset with respect to an adjacent jack in the lower row at least a distance of approximately a length of a jack. Meckley does disclose a multi-level multi-port jack

Art Unit: 2833

housing having receptacles in at least two levels which the receptacle are either in line with one another (i.e., in vertical columns) or offset from one another (col. 14, lines 59-64). Further, Fair discloses the use of such a bi-level offset multi-port (figs. 1a-1c and col. 4, lines 10-18). Moreover, variations in the distance of approximately a length of a jack would have been obvious minor adjustments without patentable significance. See In re Aller, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (Where general conditions of the claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover optimal or workable ranges by routine experimentation). Therefore, one having an ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to change the offset distances between the jacks in order to minimize the crosstalk as well as reducing the spacing of the jack.

As per claim 50, Meckley discloses that the jacks include RJ-45 jacks (col. 14, lines 59-60).

As per claim 51, Meckley inherently discloses that the shield structure includes conductive material, and Fair also disclose the shield structure include conductive material (col. 7, line 66).

As per claim 52, Meckley does not disclose that the shield structure includes carbon-filled material. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize any suitable materials that prevent crosstalk and signal degradation, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. Furthermore, applicant has not disclosed that the use of carbon-filled material solves any stated

problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any material.

As per claim 53, Meckley discloses the frame (102) is molded plastic.

As per claim 54, Meckley does not disclose that the frame includes two rows of twelve jacks each. Fair, however, discloses that any number of jacks can be formed in each row. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the teaching of Fair in the Meckley invention in order to produce the claimed invention because Fair teaches or suggest that any number of jack can be formed in each row.

As per claims 55-60, these claims recite subject matter substantially similar to claims 48-54; therefore, they are rejected under the similar rationale.

As per claims 61-67, these claims differ from claims 48-54 in that they recite the plurality of jacks define subsets of adjacent jack pairs, the jacks of each adjacent jack pair being offset relative to each other in two directions. It is obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art that any offset configuration of the adjacent jack pairs can be employed in order to effectively reduce the crosstalk.

4. Claims 68-70 are allowed.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the prior art does not explicitly discloses the telecommunication device as claimed, and including the jacks of the second plurality of jacks being centered directly

below the first set of gaps defined between the jacks of the first plurality of jacks such that none of the jacks of the second plurality of jacks include portions that overlap with the jacks of the first plurality of jacks located directly above the second plurality of jacks and the jacks of the first plurality of jacks being centered directly above the second set of gaps defined between the jacks of the second plurality of jacks such that none of the jacks of the first plurality of jacks include portions that overlap with the jacks of the second plurality of jacks located directly below the first plurality of jacks, in combination with the other limitations of the base claim.

6. Applicant's arguments filed on July 19, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that neither Meckley nor Fair teaches or suggests each jack in the upper row is horizontally offset with respect to an adjacent jack in the lower row at least a distance of approximately a length of a jack. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Meckley specifically discloses a multi-level multi-port jack housing having jacks wherein the jacks are offset from one another (col. 14, lines 62-64) and suggests that the jacks are desirable to space or distance from one another as much as possible to reduce crosstalk between the jacks (col. 3, lines 56-61). Further, Meckley specifically refers to Fair reference to disclose a variation of offset configurations (col. 3, lines 48-52 of Meckley). Fair discloses in Figs. 1A and 1B and column 4, lines 32-36 that each jack in the upper row is horizontally offset with respect to an adjacent jack in the lower row.

Applicant further argues that there is no motivation or suggestion in the art to increase the offset distances between the adjacent jacks of Meckley or Fair. As pointed out in the previously paragraph, Meckley does clearly suggest that the jacks are desirable to space or distance from one another as much as possible to reduce crosstalk between them. And further, applicant argues that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based on improper hindsight reasoning. It is pointed out that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based on hindsight reasoning, but so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time the claimed invention was made and does not include knowledge gleaned only from applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. In re McLaughlin 443 F.2d 1392, 1395, 170 USPQ 209, 212 (CCPA 1971). Furthermore, it appears that applicant suggests the examiner is applying an "obvious to try" rationale in support of an obviousness rejection. It is pointed out that it is Meckley suggesting such an "obvious to try" to separate each of the jacks from one to the others at a desired distance to obtain an optimal crosstalk reduction, and the court in Ball Corp. (Fed. Cir. 1991) held "obvious to try" is proper if the reference does disclose or suggest such a motivation.

Applicant agreed that it is specifically stated in Meckley that it is desirable to space or distance the contact or terminal members from one another as much as possible, but argued that column 2, lines 54-58 of Meckley and column 1, lines 53-57 of Fair specifically stated it has become increasingly necessary to increase the number of modular connectors ports which can be mounted in a given area. It is pointed out the

text as applicant referred to is a general discussion in the background of Meckley and fair inventions. It is further pointed out that the elimination of crosstalk must not compromise even though the intention to increase number of modular connector ports mounted in a given area is considered.

**7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Xuong M. Chung-Trans whose telephone number is (571) 272-2002. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula Bradley can be reached on (571) 272-2800 extension 33.. The fax



Art Unit: 2833

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



X. Chung-Trans



**HIEN VU**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**